



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: 117638

Shoji KANO et al.

Appln. No.: 10/695,870

Group Art Unit: 3742

Confirmation No.: 6694

Examiner: V. Patel

Filed: October 30, 2003

For: HEATING APPARATUS WHICH HAS ELECTROSTATIC ADSORPTION
FUNCTION, AND METHOD FOR PRODUCING IT

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF
REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

BOX ISSUE FEE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's statement regarding the reasons for allowance, in the final paragraph on page 2 of the Notice of Allowability mailed January 25, 2005, please enter and consider the following comments:

COMMENTS

Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference or presumption drawn from the Examiner's statement regarding the reasons for allowance. Further, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's statement regarding the reasons for allowance.

**COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF
REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/695,870
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 117638**

The Examiner's statement regarding the reasons for allowance loosely paraphrases the language of the claims. Therefore, the Examiner's statement regarding the reasons for allowance does not accurately represent the claimed invention.

Further, the Examiner's statement regarding the reasons for allowance makes a representation regarding what is claimed. Independent of the extent to which the Examiner's representation fails to correspond to the claim language, the representation does not pertain to all of the allowed claims. However, the Examiner does not indicate the specific claims in which certain features are recited and the specific claims in which they are not recited. Consequently, the Examiner's statement regarding the reasons for allowance could be incorrectly construed to imply that each and every allowed claim requires all of the features mentioned by the Examiner. Each and every allowed claim does not require all of the features recited by the Examiner. Some claims were allowed for other independent reasons. This is evident in the claims themselves and in the Examiner's Office Actions and the Applicant's replies thereto.


For example, the Examiner does not differentiate the language of independent claim 1 from the language of independent claim 19. Independent claim 19 does not recite or require that the volume resistivity of the insulating layer be varied in a shape of a concentric circle in a plane.

Applicant submits that the allowed claims speak for themselves, and do not require additional clarification to determine their respective scopes.

**COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF
REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/695,870
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 117638**

Please enter Applicant's comments into the above-identified application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark R. Woodall".

William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Mark R. Woodall
Registration No. 43,286

WPB:MRW/sqb

Date: March 28, 2005